8/M

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/464,303	12/15/1999	GREGORY L. STAHL	B0801/7156	7348

7590 07/23/2004

HELEN C LOCKHART
WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS P C
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210

EXAMINER	
VANDERVEGT, FRANCOIS P	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1644	

DATE MAILED: 07/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/464,303	STAHL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	F. Pierre VanderVegt	1644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 April 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *42-62* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *58-60* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *42-57,61 and 62* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The Examiner in charge of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to F. Pierre VanderVegt, Ph.D. in Art Unit 1644.

Claim 35 has been canceled previously.

Claims 1-34 and 36-41 have been canceled presently.

New claims 42-62 have been added and are the subject of examination in the present Office Action.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 26, 2004 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 42-57 and 61-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a written description rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed April 24, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has submitted new claims to remove the recitation of "functional variants," reciting only that the claims include "conservative substitutions," asserting that the specification at page 19, line 23 through page 20, line 9 provides adequate support for demonstrating that Applicant had possession of the claimed invention. The examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's position. It is noted that the specification at page 19, line 23 through page 20, line 9 defines "conservative substitutions" only in terms of an "amino acid substitution that does not alter the relative charge or size characteristics of the peptide

in which the amino acid substitution is made" (page 19, lines 27-29, for example). Other than the assertion that conservative substitutions can be made to generate "functional equivalents," there is no evidence that the number of substitutions within a single CDR3 segment which can be tolerated without affecting the "function" of the CDR3 has been even contemplated. While a single substitution may not "alter the relative charge or size characteristics of the peptide," substitution of 50 or 60% of the amino acids in a single CDR3 is likely to affect those properties.

Furthermore, the claims, reading upon any MBL-binding peptide comprising the CDR3 (or a variant comprising conservative substitutions therein) of one of the three recited monoclonal antibodies reads upon any antibody that may contain the same CDR3 (or a variant comprising conservative substitutions therein). This reads upon any other MBL-binding antibody molecule that possesses a CDR3 region meeting these limitations. The likelihood of other MBL-binding antibody clones using the same CDR3 or one with only conservative substitutions would be expected by one skilled in the art to be quite high because, being directed to the same antigen, as the same germline gene would be expected to generate multiple clones with variations due to hypermutation. However, the three monoclonal antibodies of the present specification do not provide an adequate amount of written descriptive support for this as-yet undetermined genus of anti-MBL antibodies.

Lastly, Applicant does not appear to have been in possession of conservative substitutions of the CDR1, CDR2 or CDR3 regions of the described monoclonal antibodies because the sequence of the monoclonal antibodies is not disclosed. Accordingly, without knowing the sequence of the parent antibody, Applicant could not possibly have known of variants of those regions comprising conservative substitutions. The specification also does not disclose which residues of the core sequence are required for binding, i.e., cannot be changed and maintain functional MBL binding, nor does it disclose where within that core sequence amino acid residues can be added, which residues can be changed or deleted or what type of change can actually be tolerated.

It does not appear based upon the limited disclosure that Applicant was in possession of the necessary common attributes or features of the elements possessed by the members of the genus in view of the limited number of species disclosed and the extensive variation permitted within the genus of an MBL-binding peptide comprising "a CDR3 of a monoclonal antibody produced by hybridoma cell line 3F8 deposited under ATCC Accession No. HB-12621, hybridoma cell line 2A9 deposited under ATCC Accession No. HB-12620, or hybridoma cell line hMBL1.2 deposited under ATCC Accession No. HB-12619, or said CDR3 "with a conservative substitution therein, wherein the conservatively substituted CDR3 binds to human MBL." The same is applicable to conservative substitutions of CDRs 1 & 2.

3. Claims 42-57 and 61-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for an antibody produced by the hybridoma cell lines 2A9, 3F8 and hMBL1.2 and antigen-binding fragments thereof does not reasonably provide enablement for the broader recitation of a peptide comprising an MBL CDR3 region of said antibodies, other antibodies bearing the same CDR3 or with a conservative substitution in the CDR3, CDR2 or CDR1 thereof. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Applicant traverses the rejection on the grounds that a working model is not needed, it would not require undue experimentation to show that a peptide consisting of one of the disclosed CDR3 peptides would bind to MBL, and applicant has shown that peptides such as the antibodies disclosed, F(ab) and $F(ab')_2$ fragments bind to MBL. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. In the first case, while a peptide consisting of one of the disclosed CDR3 regions may very well bind to MBL, there is no adequate demonstation that longer peptides of, other than the CDR3 segment, undisclosed sequence will also bind to MBL. The amino acid residues which would flank the CDR3, while not directly involved with the act of binding will, nevertheless, affect the ability of that CDR3 to bind MBL, as each residue contributes to the overall 3D and charge characteristics of the peptide. Applicant argues, in regard to the Janeway reference (of record), that CDR1 and CDR2 "might further contribute partially to binding," in asserting that Janeway stresses the importance of CDR3 to binding. In fact, Janeway treats CDR1, CDR2, and CDR3 equally and does not emphasize any one over the others. Further, Janeway clearly shows that not only are all three CDRs important, but the intervening sequences contribute significantly to the 3-dimensional relationship of CDR1, CDR2, and CDR3 to one another, orienting the CDRs properly for forming the binding site. Applicant's further contention that peptides comprising the CDR3, in the form of F(ab) and $F(ab')_2$ fragments, have been shown bind MBL is not convincing to support the broad recitation of the claims, as applicant is reminded that F(ab) and $F(ab')_2$ fragments also comprise CDR1 and CDR2 regions and comprise both the heavy chain variable region and the light chain variable region, meaning that the Ab fragments have CDR1, CDR2, and CDR3 contributions from both chains.

Applicant attempts to support the argument that peptides comprising the CRD3 would be able to bind MBL by citing articles by Laune, Monnet, Taub and Igarashi (citations on page 9 of response filed April 24, 2004). However, each of the references teaches that CDR-containing fragments of the antibodies from which they are derived are capable of binding to the target antigen. The references do not

support conservative substitutions, nor do they support peptides not derived from the antibody comprising the CDRs.

Lastly, the specification is not enabling for the making of peptides comprising conservative substitutions of the CDR1, CDR2 or CDR3 regions of the described monoclonal antibodies because the sequence of the monoclonal antibodies is not disclosed. The specification also does not disclose which residues of the core sequence are required for binding, i.e., cannot be changed and maintain functional MBL binding, nor does it disclose where within that core sequence amino acid residues can be added, which residues can be changed or deleted or what type of conservative change can actually be tolerated. Without a teaching of even the sequence of the parent monoclonal antibodies, it would require an undue amount of experimentation on the part of the artisan to ascertain the sequences of the CDR1, CDR2 or CDR3 regions of the described monoclonal antibodies and make peptides with conservative substitutions therein, maintaining the ability to bind MBL.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 58-60 are allowed.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to F. Pierre VanderVegt whose telephone number is (571) 272-0852. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 6:30-4:00; Alternate Fridays 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on (571) 272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

F. Pierre VanderVegt, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
July 16, 2004

PATRICK J. NOLAN, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER
7/20/04